

---

# NEWS IN BRIEF

---

## OPEN MEETING MAY 4: Ombudsman Nominations

Nominations for the new office of ombudsman may be made at an open meeting Tuesday, May 4, at 11 a.m. in the Fine Arts Auditorium, or in writing to the President's Office by May 12.

Faculty, administrators, support staff and students may nominate for the office that is to "increase the responsiveness of the institution to the complaints of its individual members." The position calls for familiarity with University governance; tact and independence; and an advance reputation for integrity and impartiality with all segments of the University Community.

## ANNENBERG: Zellerbach and Prince

The Annenberg Center's largest and most technically elaborate facility, the Zellerbach Theater, will be dedicated on Thursday, May 6, at 11:30 a.m.

Senator Jacob Javits of New York and Miss Nancy Hanks, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, will join University Trustees, faculty and students for the dedication of the Theater, named for emeritus trustee Harold L. Zellerbach. The ceremony comes just three weeks after the dedication of the Harold Prince Theater, which was held on April 16, with Mr. Prince, an alumnus and former Penn Player, as guest of honor.

Both theaters provide for straight drama, music and dance. The Zellerbach Theater, seating up to 970, is for large-scale productions, while the Prince Theater, accommodating up to 200, is designed for smaller productions and experimental staging.

## SENATE ELECTS DR. CROCKETT

At its April 27 meeting, the Senate selected the slate drawn by its nominating committee: Jean Crockett, Chairman-Elect; Lawson Soulsby, Secretary-Elect; Advisory Committee members Louis Girifalco, Phoebe Leboy, Murray Murphey and Robert Mundheim; and Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee members Stephen Goldstein and Louise Shoemaker.

The Senate also adopted, with amendments, a December 1970 proposal to revise election procedures. Text will appear in Almanac May 18. For messages by the outgoing and incoming Senate chairmen, see pages 2 and 3 of this issue.

## COUNCIL MEETS MAY 12

Council's last spring meeting—3 p.m. May 12 in the Council Room, Furness—will have discussion but not action on the ROTC report. Also on the agenda: the Status of Women report, a proposal for a public administration program, and special procedures for election of Council members.

## STUDENT-FACULTY CONFRONTATION

The Senate Advisory Committee will meet student members of Council for volleyball Wednesday, May 5, at 4:30 p.m. on the River Field. There is no admission charge.

*Almanac is edited by Karen C. Gaines at the University News Bureau, 524 Franklin Building.*

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- SENATE: *Messages from Herbert Callen and Henry Abraham*
- TRUSTEES: *Gulf Angola Proxies*
- GSAS: *Annual Meeting May 7*
- COMMENT ON ROTC: *Whippman Letter*  
*McMichael Letter*
- *Threat to Academic Freedom* (New York Times)
- *President Meyerson's Hey Day Address*
- CHARETTE: *40th Street Park Plan*
- SUPPLEMENT: The ROTC Recommendations

---

# Almanac

Volume 17, Number 9

May 4, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

---

## DEAN BURKET TO RETIRE

Dr. Lester W. Burket, Dean of the School of Dental Medicine since 1951, has announced his plans to retire from the deanship on June 30, 1972. He will continue as Professor of Oral Medicine.

President Martin Meyerson has announced the appointment of a committee to search for a new dean.

Chaired by Dr. Benjamin Hammond, Professor of Microbiology in the dental school, the interdisciplinary committee includes, from the dental school:

Dr. Morton Amsterdam, Professor of Periodontal Prosthesis;

Dr. Irwin Ship, Professor of Oral Medicine;

Dr. Vernon Brightman, Professor of Oral Medicine;

Dr. Anthony Vito, Associate Professor of Operative Dentistry;

Dr. Seymour Oliet, Associate Professor of Oral Medicine;

Douglas Peterson, a third-year student; and

Ronald Strauss, a second-year student.

Others on the committee are:

Dr. Alfred Gellhorn, Dean of the School of Medicine;

Dr. Robert R. Marshak, Chairman of Clinical Studies (Vet);

Dr. Robert D. Eilers, Professor of Insurance, (Wharton);

Edward Sparer, Associate Professor of Law;

Miss Barbara Lowery, Instructor of Psychiatric Nursing; and

Dr. David R. Goddard, University Professor of Science and Public Policy in the Fels Center of Government.

A member of the Dental Alumni Society will serve as advisor to the search committee.

Dr. Burket, was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1929 and from the dental school in 1932. He is one of a small number of dentists who also earned an M.D. degree, which he received from Yale University School of Medicine in 1936.

During his medical school years, Dr. Burket was a Rockefeller Fellow in pathology at Yale, and for a year after his graduation was a Sterling Fellow in pathology there. He re-

(Continued on Page 8)

---

# THE SENATE

---

## Reflections on the State of the Faculty *By Herbert Callen*

Twelve months ago I began my term as Senate Chairman with the quaint and innocent expectation that I would be concerned primarily with large questions of academic policy. Those concerns tend to get lost in the pressing day-to-day business of committees, of Council, of acting as ombudsman to the faculty, and of what Tom Wolfe has aptly called *Flak Catching*. But certain coherent impressions emerge strongly—hence these reflections.

Particularly distressing has been the continual confrontation of endless small contests of power. We are all aware of the external forces that press on the University, but the naked play of power within the University family is an uncongenial concept. It is a reality.

The students understand power very well, and they play the political game with gusto, verve, and finesse. I claim no particular expertise on the contemporary student culture, but I do claim a special knowledge of the little coterie of student political leaders. Whether they truly represent the general student body is moot; in the councils of the University, *de facto*, they *are* the students. They serve no dogma. They are simply a group of extremely bright young people, uninclined to the passivity of the classic student role, restive under the deferment of active outlets for their natural energies, well intentioned but impatient, and intoxicated by the excitement of political leadership. They are pledged to an inexorable drive for student power, pressed cleverly, flexibly, but unrelentingly.

The Administration occupies the natural seat of political power. In the absence of centripetal forces, power gravitates spontaneously to the offices of College Hall.

Between these two forces stands the faculty. The weapons of the faculty are frail. The students deal in concrete demands—more membership on committees, election of Trustees, increase in the student representation on Council, the right to read and judge admissions applications—to name just a few issues on which I fought (futile) holding actions this year. The faculty bids for influence only through the persuasive force of responsible advice. It anchors its power only in the strength of its own commitment to a common goal.

Because the University *is* the Faculty, a faculty agreed on an institutional purpose needs no weapons whatever. Power contests exist only because the faculty is in a period of reassessment, uncertain of future directions.

Through the 1950's and 1960's there was consensus on the purposes of the University. We strove for academic excellence. We assembled an illustrious faculty and we upgraded the academic quality of the student body. Administration and faculty agreed on institutional aspirations, and we built one of the great intellectual centers of this country.

Many problems now bedevil the University. Perhaps the most profound of these is rooted in the wide democratization of higher education. As with every social advance, its inception causes painful dislocations. It has converted higher education from a privilege to little more than compulsory detention for some students. Young people to whom the conventional form of higher education is not congenial are forced by social or family pressures to attend the University. They find the University irrelevant.

There is a national need for a multiplicity of institutions of varied character, to meet the increasingly wide range of student needs. The vanishing of the skilled crafts in this country—electricians, plumbers, etc.—may well be met by a wedding between an altered form of collegiate education and a professionalization of the crafts. Operational social service and social reform may be the focus of other types of colleges. Colleges *are* adapting to these new roles in quiet experiments across the country, in community colleges, in new institutions, in State Universities, in technical institutes attaining college certification, etc.

What is Penn's role in this educational revolution? There is a clamor that we must respond simultaneously to all of these demands, to satisfy the needs of every student who may happen to be upon our campus.

I submit that the University cannot and should not attempt to respond to all these needs, as if we had no history, no established character, no special talents. We should reaffirm our particular role as a great intellectual center, with a faculty undifferentiated between undergraduate and graduate studies, focused on scholarship in depth, and adapted to the teaching of students of high academic ability. We must do that which we can do well, and we must have the courage to refuse to dissipate our unique resources on programs for which we have no special ability.

We should cherish our graduate and professional excellence, preserving their quality even while the country temporarily diverts its priorities from research and scholarship.

Our innovative energies should be directed to the strengthening and development of new programs of undergraduate education which will call upon our graduate and professional resources. We must aggressively seek out those students who, by reason of ability and commitment to academic values, can profit from the established strengths of the University of Pennsylvania. Some will say that such students are anachronisms, rare and approaching extinction. I believe that to be a misreading of the dynamics of social evolution. A generation or two ago the children of the affluent were squandering college in booze, hoop-la, and high jinks. But unnoticed, in the college libraries and laboratories, a serious, upwardly-mobile class of students was quietly working. In time these dedicated students shunted their decadent colleagues aside, to seize the positions of leadership in the society. It was not a national catastrophe, but the analogue of the lizard's annual molting of its worn skin. That process is being repeated again, with one alteration. The enormous increase in affluence in our country has changed not the character but the numbers of those to be displaced. The anguish of their decline has spawned the mythology of the counter-culture. But again, serious, concerned and dedicated young people are quietly working to build a better future for themselves and for this country. Many are here at Penn, as anyone who seeks them out can soon discover. But, unhappily, most are elsewhere—at our less illustrious sister institutions. It is they whom we can serve, and it is they whom we should attract.

Finally, in University governance we must develop those administrative and academic structures which integrate graduate and undergraduate education, rather than isolate them. I

believe that the weakness of our formal graduate school structure has, in fact, been a virtue for precisely this reason. Under departmental organization the continuum from freshman to Ph.D. has been preserved intact. Perhaps we have paid a price in partial isolation of one discipline from another, and that is a problem which remains to be solved. But I hope that

it is not done by the division of undergraduate and graduate concerns.

The University has paused for reassessment after two decades of vigorous achievement. I hope that the Senate will lead in a reaffirmation of our goals of academic excellence and of intellectual depth.

## Responding to a Universal Clamor *By Henry J. Abraham*

When almost exactly one year ago you accorded me the great honor to become your Chairman-Elect (and may I state at once that I had no idea of the enormous scope and range of the post!) I told you that my primary concern was, as it is now, and always will be, "for academic freedom—academic freedom for and of and by the members of the—our—academic community to learn, to teach, to research, to administer, to strive, to seek the truth." This means, I went on, "above all, the ability to pursue these activities free from fear, the presence of orderly process, the rejection of violence, the exaltation of reason and civility."

That these overriding elements have been preserved for us, and are present today, is due in no small measure to the dedication, the perceptiveness, the energy, and the tenacity of your outgoing Chairman, Herbert Callen. For 18 hours a day, seven days a week, he labored throughout the past year in back-breaking fashion in all our behalves—and we owe him a profound debt of gratitude for his magnificently dedicated work. He gave up all teaching and research, and most of his private life to perform the ever-increasing functions of Chairman of the Senate who, as I hope you know, is also Chairman of your 18-man Senate Advisory Committee; Vice-Chairman of the University Council; and, alas, Chairman of the latter's workhorse Steering Committee. I shall endeavor to follow his example, and I pledge you my maximum resolve and my maximum effort—but you should know that I shall *not* forego all of my teaching: I couldn't stand it, and hence I shall avail myself of the statutory option of teaching a one-half load (which means that for at least 3 hours a week I shall be safely—I hope—ensconced in class, away from the telephone, among other things!).

While the past year has seen a general preservation of the constellation of academic freedom on our campus, I would be remiss were I not to note the often tenuous state of faculty influence (some would call it power, I suppose). Indeed, the past few years may well have seen a very real diminution of the "clout"—to use a hackneyed but telling noun—the faculty began to enjoy in the 1950's and 1960's, especially since 1963, unquestionably due to the assertive rise of other constituent groups, notably students (which is not a unique local phenomenon, needless to relate).

In and of itself that development may not at all be unhealthy, for all of the University's constituent interest or pressure groups—and that is what they are—presumably operate to make this University community into a better place for all its component parts and thereby a more meaningful and more valuable contributor to democratic society. By the same token, however, constituent interest groups have particular constituent interests, which they are entitled to press and urge.

It is precisely in that category that we, the Faculty, have not done very well of late—frequently because of apathy but more frequently because (a) an unwillingness and/or inability to spend sufficient time at the tasks of University govern-

ance, and (b) an unwillingness to give battle when giving battle was called for in the interest of an effective faculty vote in University decision-making. Time and again we, during the past two or three years, lost crucial votes in the University Council simply because our representatives could not stay until the meeting's end—or because they couldn't bear to hear even one more lengthy student discourse. On many an occasion we would then see what we began to call the 5 o'clock-homeward-bound faculty exodus. *Please—and I do plead—if you are a member of, or are elected to Council or the Senate Advisory Committee, reserve Wednesday afternoons for the duration of your terms in office.* Tell your husbands and wives you will not be home for dinner. It is fair neither to your constituents nor to the Faculty as a whole to accept election to these vital posts if attendance at the inherent functions cannot truly approach a maximum. I assure you that the student members of Council have no such problems!

In concluding these brief remarks, let me re-express one other deeply-felt commitment which I also voiced a year ago in this forum: We must do all in our power to ascertain that this campus is responsive to the universal clamor for participation in the decision-making process by students. I think we have done very well on that score. Speaking as a participant in the governmental process at the faculty level, I support student input, i.e. a student *voice*, at all levels, barring none. But that does not necessarily mean either numerical equality or a *vote*—and there remain areas of the decision-making process where I would continue to refuse a vote in contrast to a *voice*—such as that of professional promotion and/or tenure. There, or so I, for one, remain convinced, final decisions must be made exclusively by those who possess the requisite knowledge, the experience, the professionalism, and, yes, that continuity of internal institutional service which students lack—for their participatory concerns are by definition and nature temporary or transient.

But, whatever the decision taken, it is essential, it is non-negotiable, if you please, that orderly process be observed and respected. To repeat words penned by Abe Fortas in halcyon days:

Dissent and dissenters have no monopoly on freedom.

They must tolerate opposition. They must accept dissent from their dissent.\*

In that spirit all elements of the campus must accept the basic proposition that it cannot be, it must not be, and I daresay it will not ultimately be, a sanctuary from the law—which, after all, is as the cement of society. Without law there is no liberty, and where there is no liberty the people perish. As members of the Faculty of a great University, it is our primary obligation to continue to do all in our power to foster the spirit of liberty. *I ask for your help.*

\**Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience* (New York: Signet Books, 1968), p. 126.



---

# THE TRUSTEES

---

## GULF ANGOLA PROXY FIGHT

*Before voting its Gulf Oil Corporation stock at the Corporation's annual meeting April 27, the University sent the following letter to Gulf Chairman E. D. Brockett on April 26, 1971:*

As Chairman of the University of Pennsylvania Trustees' Committee on Corporate Responsibility, I am writing to you with respect to the voting of the University's shares on four proxy proposals of the Gulf Angola Project to be submitted to your Annual Meeting on April 27th.

Our Committee has held a hearing at which we afforded an opportunity to appear and present their views to all persons on and off the campus who had expressed a wish to be heard on these four proposals. Although we have decided to vote the University's shares against the four proposals, we wanted to share with you some of the thoughts we had in the hope that they will receive careful consideration by your board of directors and your management.

We find ourselves in full accord with the major stated objective of the Gulf Angola Project—self-determination for the Angolan people. Nevertheless we remain unconvinced that approval and implementation of the proposals would make any real contribution to this goal. Indeed, in our discussion of the related proposals No. 1 and No. 4, we concluded that withdrawal of Gulf from Angola might well result in the abandonment of its properties to the Colonial Government, a possibility conceded by the representatives of the Gulf Angola Project who appeared before us. If this should occur it would merely enable that government to take over the operation, probably on a basis most profitable to it and furthering its own perpetuation. While we recognize that Gulf cannot take an active part in the internal controversy in Angola or in choosing among the various and disunited political groups dedicated to the independence of Angola, it may be that the company can use the influence of its presence there toward the ultimate objective of self-determination. We suggest that Gulf consider the formation of a study committee, independent of the company, comprised of recognized authorities in appropriate disciplines, which would review Gulf's current involvement in Angola and other colonial areas and define the proper role of the company.

With respect to proposal No. 2 requiring the disclosure of corporate charitable gifts, we feel that its adoption would not serve desirable philanthropic and public service purposes. We fear it would lead to indiscriminate solicitations and expose the corporation to undeserved recrimination because of its selection of one recipient rather than another perhaps in the same field. We do recommend that Gulf provide greater information to its stockholders as to its corporate contributions policy and criteria and that it specify its donations by category without being under any obligation to name the specific donors. We believe this would be consistent with Gulf's general policies in apprising its stockholders of significant facts of the company's operations.

With respect to proposal No. 3 calling for the enlargement of the board of directors, we believe that the public interest in corporate affairs can best be served by avoiding special interest representation on boards of directors. We feel that every director must use his best judgment in serving the interests, both public and private, of the entire corporation and not those of any particular constituency. On the other hand, we believe that national companies should give con-

sideration to achieving a broad diversification of their board membership.

While we are supporting the management position with respect to these proposals, we urge that your board of directors give serious consideration to the suggestions we have made.

Very truly yours

Bernard G. Segal

For the Trustees' Committee on Corporate Responsibility

Charles D. Dickey, Jr.

John W. Eckman

A. Leon Higginbotham

Carl Kaysen

Donald T. Regan

Marietta Tree

---

## GRADUATE SCHOOL

---

### ANNUAL MEETING MAY 7

The Annual Meeting of the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences will be held on Friday, May 7, 1971 at 2:00 P.M. in the Fine Arts Auditorium (Room B-1).

Election of quadrant representatives to the Council of the Graduate School and Secretaries of the Division will be the first order of business, followed by the report of the Acting Dean.

The Council of the Graduate School has had a busy year considering the reports of its committees. These committees were authorized by the Annual Meeting of 1969, and their present status is listed below:

**Graduate Student Life:** Chairman, Dr. Mitchell Litt. A preliminary report has been made emphasizing the inadequacy of stipends for both service and non-service awards in times of steep inflation. There seems little we can do about stipends at this time; actually we probably have backed unknowingly into a partial loan program. The report points out the continuing need for a Graduate Center. Happily, two items called for by the report are now actualities: a cooperative store and day-care centers.

**Fellowship Procedures:** Chairman, Dr. Robert Palmer. The major recommendation of this committee is that the bulk of fellowships now awarded by the Graduate School through the Fellowship Committee of Graduate Council be divided up among the Graduate Groups. The awards of the Graduate Groups would be subject to an examination for quality by a committee similar to the present Fellowship Committee. The committee is now considering guidelines for the division of awards among the Graduate Groups and would welcome faculty comment on the general proposition as well as specifics.

**Structure and Function:** Chairman, Dr. Paul Bianchi. The committee has proposed several structures for consideration by Council. When Council has discussed these proposals, they will report to the Faculty.

**Degree Requirements:** Chairman, Dr. Oliver Williams. This committee has gone over the degree requirements of the Bulletin eliminating inconsistencies, correcting errors, and generally bringing the statements into line with current policy. Most of the changes need not be discussed with the Faculty, but the following are of sufficient interest to be reported:

Each Graduate Group will make available to all entering students its detailed degree requirements, including language requirements, examination scope, time limits, within the rules of the Graduate School. These requirements are reviewed periodically by the appropriate Committee on Instruction.

(Continued on Page 7)

# Comment on the Dwyer Subcommittee Report on ROTC

*Two members of the Committee on Undergraduate Affairs have separately forwarded to the Steering Committee the statements below for consideration during the Council's May 12 deliberations on the Report itself. In addition, the Office of the Secretary will shortly have available (1) a summary of actions taken at other institutions and (2) a position paper on ROTC endorsed by certain national associations including the Association of American Universities.*

## THE WHIPPMAN LETTER

We recognize that Professor Dwyer's subcommittee devoted considerable time and effort to an arduous and demanding task, and we do not differ lightly with the sincere and reasoned conclusions of ten of our colleagues. We feel, however, that by focusing their discussion on the structure of an ROTC program the subcommittee might have prejudged the fundamental question—is any form of ROTC appropriate on a University campus?

This question raises issues of academic freedom and the nature of the University. It is more a moral than an academic problem, and there is no easy answer. Nonetheless, after three years of discussion and innumerable committees, the question must be asked. We feel that only the full Council can decide a matter of this importance, and we make no recommendation as to the answer. However, we strongly urge the Council to make consideration of this point their first order of business.

If their decision is that ROTC has no place at the University, no more need be said. If there is to be some form of ROTC program on campus, however, we must ask whether it should be closely integrated into the academic structure of the University or should be treated as much as possible as an extra-curricular activity. On this point we differ with the Dwyer subcommittee. We feel they went beyond their charge in recommending the establishment of regular academic departments of Military and Naval Science and the introduction of undergraduate major and graduate programs in these areas. ROTC has only become an issue on campus because many students and faculty members have serious doubts about the propriety of military studies in a University community, and it seems inappropriate to respond to such doubts by recommending more programs in these areas. We question whether the University wishes to establish one of the most active departments of Military Science in the country merely to ensure the continuance of ROTC ON CAMPUS.

We should like to point out that the Faculties of three of the undergraduate schools have acted to limit the scope of ROTC as an academic activity. We strongly suggest that any further action to change the present ROTC program should

*(Continued on Page 6)*

## THE McMICHAEL LETTER

The task of the subcommittee on AROTC-NROTC of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee, according to its charge, was to determine whether ROTC presence on The University of Pennsylvania campus *should continue under any conditions*. After many months of deliberation during which time all interested persons and groups were given ample opportunity to present their views on the question, the subcommittee submitted a unanimous report laying down the conditions under which it felt ROTC programs should be continued. The subcommittee report stands on its own merits as its recommendations specifically required that the University of Pennsylvania and the Department of Defense consider mutual accommodations which will improve the ROTC programs from the point of view of both organizations. The recommendations of the subcommittee enable a step-by-step transformation of the program to meet the objections raised by previous committees with respect to the ROTC program.

The report of the subcommittee on ROTC-NROTC of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee dated April 20, 1970, the report of the Wharton School Ad Hoc Committee to study the Academic Status of the ROTC Programs dated May 6, 1969, and the report of the Committee on Instruction of the College concerning ROTC and NROTC (date Fall of 1968?) were studies involving the question of academic credit for ROTC and NROTC courses. Each of these committees' reports indicated that the question of the presence of ROTC programs on campus was outside its scope or charge. Yet the recommendations of each regarding credit toward the baccalaureate degree for courses are based upon the admitted facts that the Departments of Military and Naval Science are not established academic departments and that members of these departments are not appointed by the University. The present subcommittee report (Dwyer report) is directed toward establishing machinery to meet these specific objections to ROTC courses.

The subcommittee's recommendations for the development of a Department or Departments of Military Science have considerable merit on a purely academic basis. Dr. Paul Lloyd has summarized this view quite well in a memorandum.

"What impresses me most about the report is that it recognizes the importance that the study of war and military science may have apart from practical programs of training, i.e., the ROTC program. It is an old cliché that war is too important to be left to the generals. It also happens to be true. Unfortunately the study of war has largely been left in the hands of professional soldiers, who, as Liddell Hart points out, often are not the best qualified persons to engage in research. Military organizations by their very nature place great stress on loyalty and obedience, and these qualities do not promote the critical, disinterested study of any subject. However, as long as educated people refuse to study war and conflict, its nature and its causes, it is unlikely that anyone will ever be able to offer serious opposition to the viewpoints of the practitioners of war themselves.

*(Continued on Page 6)*



## ROTC Comment (Whippman Continued)

be in this direction, and we believe the following recommendations are in this spirit:-

1. That academic credit should only be given for courses offered by the established academic departments and approved by the usual faculty procedures in the various undergraduate schools. Where appropriate, existing departments might develop courses of interest to students in a ROTC program, (for example, the History department might offer a course in American Military History, the Psychology department a course in the Psychology of Conflict, and so on). In a given year, such courses might be taught by academically qualified persons who are not members of the permanent faculty of the University, subject to the usual procedures for approving such an arrangement.

2. That all other activities of the ROTC program, including non-credit courses and drill, should be treated like any other extra-curricular activity on campus.

3. That the University should explore ways in which the Provost and the Faculty could play a larger part in the recruitment and appointment of the officers assigned to such a ROTC program, and that these officers be extended the normal courtesies of the academic community.

4. We support the recommendations of the Dwyer sub-committee concerning the contractual agreements between the University and the Military. We believe that contracts between individual students and the Military should not include the possibility of non-academic punishments for academic failure, and should contain no penalties for students who wish to withdraw from the ROTC program other than repayment of their scholarships over a reasonable period. The University should negotiate with the Military to ensure that ROTC contracts with individual students adhere to these principles, and it should not be a party to any contract that violates them.

Finally, we should like to re-emphasize our belief that before discussing the details of a possible program, Council should first consider whether ROTC does indeed have a place on campus.

—Michael Whippman  
Assistant Professor of Physics

## ROTC Comment (McMichael Continued)

"By separating as much as possible the departments of military science from the ROTC program, war might be studied in an atmosphere of critical research. No one would seriously maintain that the study of disease or social ills and afflictions in a university necessarily implies that the university is thereby favoring the spread of disease and social disruption, and yet some argue that the study of war must mean that the university is supporting 'oppressing, maiming, murdering' etc., etc.

"There can be no question that war is the greatest evil that has ever afflicted human society and yet some think that to study it is somehow demeaning, inevitably corrupting those who study it and inevitably subverting the humanistic ends of the university. The argument that the departments of military science will always have to be connected with the ROTC program ignores the intent of the report which is to make these departments more research oriented, and less dependent on the programs of practical training.

"In short, I cannot accept the argument that ignorance is virtue. I believe that Liddell Hart's remarks should be re-emphasized: 'The study of war as a branch of knowledge requires the method of work that prevails in a University as well as the attitude of mind which is inculcated there. But it is not likely that these needs will be fulfilled until men of learning change their attitude towards war, and learn to regard it as a branch of knowledge worthy of exploration.'"

The Steering Committee of the University Council will undoubtedly wish to review and evaluate critically each of the recommendations of the (Dwyer) sub-committee report. Some consideration should be given to the following ideas on specific recommendations of the Dwyer report:

Recommendation 3.8 could spell out in more detail that contracts made between ROTC units and individuals must be free of any unusual sanctions to the military to use against students who willfully evade the terms of their contracts. Recommendation 5.0 (c) could be amended to read undergraduate (and possibly graduate) programs up to and including degree programs.

—John H. McMichael  
Assistant Professor of Accounting

---

*At the request of several members of the faculty, the following editorial is reprinted from The New York Times April 27, 1971:*

## Threat to Campus Freedom

The national mood of economic frustration and anti-intellectual reaction has begun to feed a growing movement against academic tenure. The arguments marshaled for abolishing professorial job security are cloaked in high-minded rhetoric of academic reform. This is a transparent disguise of the economic and political anger which provides the true motivation.

Conservatives in rebellion against education expenditures have been joined in the anti-tenure campaign by illiberal partisans of the political left and right who have little sympathy for the academic freedom of a professor unless he represents their own brand of ideology.

There have admittedly been abuses of tenure. Universities, like all other private and public institutions, relax their internal quality controls during years of affluent amiability. But those sincerely concerned over the quality slippage that results from excessive security ought to consider the greater risk of political and economic harassment.

State legislatures and university administrators, at a time of budgetary deficits and taxpayers' revolt, are easily tempted to trade

in older and more costly talent for low-cost replacements. But this would surely speed the unionization of college faculties, with its stress on automatic promotions and seniority. Gone would be much of the scholarly consideration that has been part of the tenure system in reputable universities.

Even more serious is the danger of political purges of "wrong-thinking" professors in a period of highly emotional ideological conflict. Appalling violations of academic freedom were widespread until the American Association of University Professors gained acceptance for its statement on tenure in 1940. It was this protective shield that saved American higher education from the worst consequences of the know-nothing onslaught in the 1950's.

It would be naive to pretend that the two-front threat to academic freedom today constitutes less of a clear and present danger. That danger places a special burden on the academic leadership to tighten its own safeguards against abuses of tenure. But such reforms must be carried forward with a firm resolve not to surrender the essential protection of those freedoms without which the universities would soon become the pawn of powerful and unscrupulous forces.

© 1971 by The New York Times Company. Reprinted by permission.

## The Road Less Traveled By

As we mark this moving forward and honor some of the many here who serve our University, we should also think about a Hey Day for American higher education and for the University of Pennsylvania in particular.

We have moved ahead at Penn in many ways and we can be proud of what we have done. But along with most American universities, our undergraduate programs have been in limbo for a generation. We seem incapable even of discussing in depth what the intellectual content of undergraduate education might be. The model of English collegiate Gothic with a graft of German electives neatly packaged, American style, in equal course units persists. It is often a good model, but it is insufficient.

Many, for example, feel a lack of spirit. They come to get a degree and leave. And that is not what we should be doing here. Alfred North Whitehead said: "The justification for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, uniting the young and the old in the imaginative consideration of learning. The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform for society. A university which fails in this respect has no reason for existence." It is that kind of spirit of which I speak.

I look to a commitment from all of us in the months and years ahead so that we can more attain such a spirit at Pennsylvania and so that those who are at Pennsylvania now and will be at Hey Day next year and the year after and the ones ahead will know that we continuously and wisely move up. To say we must be committed to the improvement of education at all levels—undergraduate, graduate, professional, and postdoctoral is true but not in itself a guide to action.

Tangibly we must create a superior climate for learning. And what is the character of such a climate for learning? It has some harsh elements; it is not all benign. It has friction, as well as relaxed and persistent thought. It is breezy enough to stir thought from one section of the campus to another—it encourages the infection (or is it the cure?) of learning.

The institution with the appropriate climate as I see it presents a variety of choices, including intimacy for those who wish it and anonymity for those who so prefer. It has

coherent fixed programs and others that are fluid and developed by the students from many offerings. It promotes flexibility of timing in degree programs and courses, both for students and professors.

It puts education first—education in breadth and in depth; in method and in substance, exploring the future as well as the past and present. It must be based on the conviction that learning is fun.

We must clearly state that we intend to lead in creative educational programs and that, in doing so, we intend to find our own path. It is only through the path of educational courage and imagination, incidentally, that we will find financial support from sources previously untapped.

That path may be different from the one followed by other colleges and universities. For example, a multiplicity of routes of undergraduate study would give us an even greater richness of experience that many other colleges and universities lack. We can create superior methods of instruction and superior opportunities for learning and can use our resources to create a style of education that will be unique. Our strengths in graduate and professional education give us marvelous means to widen the range of learning available to undergraduates.

We must also include the following actions. We must be guided by merit and continue on the path toward egalitarianism in terms of color, sex, nationality.

We have a responsibility to our immediate neighborhood. However, we must also take more full advantage of the entire Philadelphia area with all its educational and recreational advantages, and for that matter take advantage of the Washington to New York region of which we are a part. Our University must become more cosmopolitan. It must forge more ties to the great centers of learning in other parts of the world.

We must bring our alumni into closer contact with the University. We should seek not only the financial resources of our graduates but their professional and avocational talents as well. I address this particularly to those of you who are about to become alumni or alumnae.

We must continue to improve our governance system. But governance should not be the focus of our concern. It should rather be a tool to accomplish our aim of educational and scholarly improvement. Improvement, incidentally, cannot come from one office; it must become part of the vision of all parts of the University community.

We must make life on this campus more pleasurable in every way possible. That intent includes the landscaping of our environment.

Finally—to repeat—we must not be afraid to be different. We have forgotten the vital historical tradition of belief in the future, in the "impossible dream," in those visions of the Garden that used to excite and beguile us.

As Pennsylvania goes through a new Hey Day there are two paths we can follow. We can choose the past, conventional way. Or we can strike out with bold intent, finding our own way in these tangled times. This is the path I believe we must take. If we do this together, we will be a large and goodly company.

We as individuals and we as the University should follow Hey Day's tradition and take the next step up. It was Robert Frost who wrote for all of us:

"Two roads diverged in a wood and I—  
I took the one less traveled by,  
And that has made all the difference."

### GSAS Annual Meeting (Continued from Page 4)

Graduate Groups may specify that candidates who have not completed their dissertations five years after passing the preliminary examination must pass a special examination as a condition of continuing as candidates in good standing.

Graduate Groups establish their own foreign language requirements.

The Committee has further recommended that a minimum tuition be set for the Ph.D. degree as a step towards dissociating financial and academic requirements. This is being negotiated with the Committee on Tuition and Fees and the results will be reported to the Faculty.

The following change in the composition of the Council of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has been approved by the Council:

Membership of the Council will be increased by one graduate student from each of the four divisions, appointed for staggered two-year terms by caucuses of the Graduate Student Association Council.

Council is constituted presently of three faculty members from each division, elected for staggered three-year terms.

—Daniel J. O'Kane, Acting Dean



From the Charette:

## 40th STREET PARK PLAN

*Charette is the planner's term for a round-the-clock work session toward a critical deadline. The University's most recent one, held by the students, administrators and city officials working on detailed proposals for a People's Park on University land, ended with the following document submitted to President Martin Meyerson and Provost Curits Reitz on April 23.*

Members of the modified Charette which met on Wednesday afternoon and a good portion of Saturday have reached the following resolution:

1. The site under consideration, between Locust and Walnut along 40th Street, could be divided into three areas:

- (a) Two areas defined as (1) extending from the south wall line of the Free Library to the northward to sidewalk line on Walnut Street and (2) from the High Rise North building line south to Locust Walk are designated as a park use demonstration site. The building line of High Rise North could move north as much as twenty feet pending design approval.

- (b) The remaining area would become a temporary austere parking lot under any conditions to be covered with gravel this summer.

- (c) A vehicular access way to High Rise North not within the sites in question will be maintained on the eastern edge of both the park and the parking areas.

2. If by October 1, 1971 the coalition members raise \$10,000 the two park areas in the demonstration site will be available for park construction and suitable barriers will limit parking to the area in 1(b) above, assuming that a construction strike does not delay opening of the building for occupancy past September 1st. If the money is not raised by October 1st the lot may be utilized in its entirety for parking during the academic year 1971-72.

3. In any case \$10,000 must be raised by the Coalition members by December 1, 1971 as an indication of both campus and local support for the park or this agreement is null and void.

4. Student members of the Coalition will initiate a campaign through which they will seek to diminish the number of cars brought to campus. Full cooperation of the University offices and the committees involved with parking will be given. Registration of cars, new regulations and strict enforcement as well as a direct approach to students to make this a pedestrian campus were among the items discussed in viewing the initiation of such a campaign.

5. If no later than April 15, 1973 the demonstration site has been developed successfully and a successful campaign has reduced the number of cars brought to the campus and thereby reduced the demand for parking space as determined by a Joint Commission of University planners and members of the Park Coalition, then the park area of the demonstration site will be expanded subject to additional funding to cover the entire area under consideration in items 1(a) and 1(b). Such a determination should be made in time to terminate parking at the end of either the academic years 1971-72 or 1972-73.

6. Members of the Coalition have discussed funding of the demonstration site with the University officers concerned with such matters. Once plans are clear for the site and given the assurance of the Coalition raising \$10,000, it is hoped that these officers will assist in finding the total funding. As the design develops and is approved it may properly contain elements of Fine Arts which could be developed subject to other needs and sites and with due consideration to paragraph 9 following.

7. Members of the University Planning Office have offered their administrative services for the expediting of construction in the demonstration site.

8. All construction work must be done by union labor so as not to jeopardize other construction in the University and must be done on a contractual basis to satisfy the Pennsylvania Higher Educational Facilities Authority.

9. All of the work done on the total site must be seen as interim usage. The University investment in the land improvements attendant indicate that at some future time, five years or more ahead, consideration will be given to either the original garage or some alternate building and that this reservation is known by all parties now.

I would like to close with a note concerning the difficulties attendant in trying to be an impartial moderator in a situation where many of the parties are known and some of them worked with intensively over a long period of time. Some of the students indicated I did not seem to be impartial in the late afternoon as we were moving toward resolution. In retrospect it would probably be difficult for me not to have sympathy toward Art Freedman's office due simply to the long working relationship that has existed between this office and his in the Student Housing Project implementation. At the same time I was pleased with the way in which the Coalition members were taking responsibility for our joint University concern over fiscal matters and were willing to tackle the possible roll-back of automobile usage so that this could become a more pedestrian campus.

We were appreciative of initial attendance on the part of staff members from the Redevelopment Authority and the Pennsylvania Higher Educational Facilities Authority. A special note of thanks should be extended to the Philadelphia Planning Commission staff, one of whom attended the entire series of meetings and all of whom were helpful in their insights and support.

—John A. Russell, Jr.  
Vice-Provost for Student Affairs

---

## DEAN BURKET

(Continued from Page 1)

turned to Pennsylvania in 1937 as instructor in oral diagnosis and rose to the rank of professor of oral medicine in 1944.

Author of a number of texts in subjects related to dental medicine, he was also director of continuation courses at Pennsylvania for 20 years, beginning in 1948; president of the American Association of Dental Schools, 1961-62; member of the Council on Dental Education of the American Dental Association and its Chairman from 1967-69; and member of the advisory committee on dental teaching facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service.

In 1946 Dr. Burket directed the Ivory Cross Expedition to Holland, and he has served in the advisory capacity to many other foreign countries. He served as consultant to the Office of the Secretary of Defense in 1966.